

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TEKEEYSHA KEYS,

Plaintiff

v.

TARGET CORPORATION,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01389-APG-DJA

Order Rejecting Proposed Pretrial Orders

[ECF Nos. 21, 22]

Each of the parties has filed a proposed pretrial order. ECF Nos. 21, 22. Local Rule 16-3(b) requires “a proposed joint pretrial order.” The plaintiff offers no explanation for her violation of this rule. The defendant “states a Pre-Trial Conference was held March 4, 2024. However, . . . the draft proposed by Plaintiff was not agreed to by Defendant.” ECF No. 22 at 1. This is not an appropriate reason to file an individual proposed order. Rather, the parties are to file a joint proposal, noting the areas of agreement and disagreement in that document. By doing so, the parties are thus able to list their objections to the other party’s exhibits and deposition designations as required by Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(b) and (11). In that regard, I warn the parties that they cannot simply make generic objections to the other party’s exhibits. Rather, each objection must be directed at a specific exhibit. I also remind the parties that “[s]tipulations on admissibility, authenticity, and/or identification of documents should be made whenever possible. . . .” LR 16-3(b)(8)(B). This is especially true here, where the parties’ respective exhibit lists include many of the same medical records.

In her proposed order, the plaintiff “reserves the right to use any or all of the medical records produced by either party in this case during this litigation. Plaintiff further reserves the right to use any documents produced or identified by Defendant during this litigation.” ECF No.

1 21 at 6. There is no such “right” to reserve. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8) requires parties to list their
2 trial exhibits, rather than attempting to reserve a non-existent right to use unidentified exhibits.
3 Vague, broad designations of potential exhibits make it impossible for the other party to object,
4 as required by Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(B).

5 I THEREFORE ORDER that the parties’ proposed pretrial orders (ECF Nos. 21, 22) are
6 **REJECTED**. The parties shall confer as required in Local Rule 16-3 and submit a joint pretrial
7 order that complies with Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 by April 1, 2024.

8 DATED this 11th day of March, 2024.

9
10 
11 _____
12 ANDREW P. GORDON
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23